REMARKS

Claims 42 – 65 are pending in this application. In the Office Action dated September 11, 2007 (hereinafter "the Instant Office Action"), claims 42 – 53 and 55 – 65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Publication No. 2007/0192410 (hereinafter "Liversidge"). Claim 54 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liversidge in view of U.S. Application Publication No. 2001/0016038 (hereinafter "Sammon"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following.

Amendments to the claims

Claims 42, 50, 53, 58, 59, and 60 have been amended to clarify the recited subject matter. Particularly, the above claims have been amended to clarify that the data conference code, when presented to the conference server by the remote device or endpoint, authorizes the remote device or endpoint to join the data conference. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments, as support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, for example, in paragraphs [0042], [0047], and FIG. 6.

Amendments to the Specification

The Specification has been amended to include description of a machine readable medium encompassing a program to perform method steps for coordinating a conference. No new matter has been added by way of this reply, as support for the amendment can be found, for example, in the original claim 18 of the specification (U.S. Application Publication No. 2002/0103864).

Objection to the Specification

The specification has been objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for claim language "machine readable medium" recited in claims 58 and 59. As stated above, the specification has been amended to include description of a machine readable medium encompassing a program to perform the functions recited in the claim

language of claims 58 and 59. Applicants believe that the amended specification now provides proper antecedent basis for the claim language "machine readable medium." Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested. Additionally, Applicants respectfully point out that various machine readable media are described in the specification. See, for example, paragraph [0029].

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 42 – 53 and 55 – 65 below.

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (see M.P.E.P. § 2131).

Claims 42 – 52 and 58

Claim 42 requires, in part, (i) a data conference initiation module for receiving a data conference code generated by the conference server, where the data conference code, when presented to the conference server by the remote device, authorizes the remote device to join the data conference and (ii) for responsively transmitting over the telephone line a data conference invitation to the remote device, where the data conference invitation includes the data conference code. Note that the above listed limitations focus on communication between the near-end endpoint and the conference server, and between near-end endpoint and the remote device.

In support for the rejection of the above listed limitations of claim 42, the Instant Office Action, on page 4, refers to paragraphs [0073] and [0186]-[0188] of Liversidge. Applicants have carefully considered the teachings of the above referenced paragraphs in addition to the teachings of paragraph [0185] and FIGS. 36 and 36a of Liversidge, and submit that Liversidge fails to show or disclose at least one of the above listed limitations of claim 42.

Liversidge discloses a communication between the VTE server and the VTE client (A) after the VTE client (A) requests the VTE server to add VTE client (C) to a multi-media session. Applicants respectfully submit that this communication, sent from the VTE server to the VTE client (A) is not a conference code, as required by claim 42.

Liversidge merely discloses that the VTE Server returns a StatusEvent message in steps 1442 (Liversidge, FIG. 36) to VTE client (A) upon receiving an AddParty message from VTE client (A) (paragraph [0185]). Liversidge discloses in paragraph [0185] that the StatusEvent is sent "to VTE clients (A) and (B) to inform the respective team members that the team member using VTE client (C) is being invited to join the multi-media communication, but [that the invitation] is pending." The StatusEvent message sent by the VTE server to the VTE client (A) cannot be equated to the conference code required by claim 42. This is because the StatusEvent is a status report of a pending invitation to a remote VTE client (C), and not a code that remote VTE client (C) presents to the VTE server to join the data conference. Liversidge is completely silent regarding the status report being a code that the remote client can present to the conference server to be authorized to join a data conference.

Even if it were assumed, *arguendo*, that the StatusEvent is a conference code that when presented to the conference server by the remote device, allows the remote device to join the data conference, Liversidge still fails to teach at least one limitation required by claim 42, which states the near-side endpoint transmits over the telephone line a data conference invitation to the remote device, where the data conference invitation includes the data conference code. In other words, Liversidge is completely silent regarding any communication transmitted from the VTE client (A) to the VTE client (C) that can be interpreted as a conference invitation, and where that conference invitation includes the StatusEvent message. As can be seen in FIG. 36 and FIG. 36a, Liversidge does not show or disclose any transmission that includes the StatusEvent is sent from VTE client (A) to VTE client (C).

Thus, Liversidge fails to show or disclose at least one limitation required by claim 42. Therefore, claim 42 is patentable over Liversidge. The arguments presented above for claim 42 also apply to claims 50 and 58. Therefore, claims 50 and 58 are patentable over Liversidge. Claims 43 – 49 and claims 51 – 52 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 42 and 50, and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to these claims is respectfully requested.

<u>Claims 53 – 57</u>

Claim 53 recites a method for initiating and managing a data conference at a conference server that requires, in part, the step of transmitting a conference code to the endpoint that sends a conference initiation request to the conference server, over the computer network. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that Liversidge fails to show or disclose, at least, the above listed limitation required by claim 53.

Liversidge discloses a VTE server that accepts an AddParty request from the VTE client (A). On receiving the AddParty request, the VTE server returns a StatusEvent message to VTE clients (A) and (B) "to inform the respective team members that the team member using VTE client (C) is being invited to join the multi-media communication session, but [that the invitation] is pending." (paragraph [0185]). The StatusEvent message sent by the VTE server to the VTE client (A) cannot be equated to the conference code required by claim 53. This is because the StatusEvent is only a status report of a pending invitation to a remote VTE client (C), and not a code that authorizes remote VTE client (C) to join the data conference. Liversidge is completely silent regarding the status report being a code that the remote client can present to the conference server to be authorized to join a data conference.

Further support to the Applicants' conclusion above is seen from the fact that Liversidge fails to disclose even a single transmission from the VTE client (A) to the VTE client (C) that includes the contents received in StatusEvent message. As implied by the claim language or claim 53, the data conference code sent by the conference server to the requesting endpoint is intended to be subsequently sent to the remote conference endpoint. Given the fact that there is no communication between the VTE client (A) and the VTE client (C) that contains includes the StatusEvent message, goes counter the an assumption that the StatusEvent message (or a part thereof) are intended to be sent to the remote conference endpoint in the first place. Therefore, Applicants again submit that the StatusEvent message received from the VTE server is not a data conference code as recited in claim 53.

Thus, Liversidge fails to show or disclose at least one limitation required by claim 53. Therefore claim 53 is patentable over Liversidge. Claims 55 – 57 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 53, and are patentable over Liversidge for at least the same

reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection with respect to the above claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 59

The method of claim 59 requires, in part, receiving an audio signal representative of a conference code from at least one conference endpoint over the telephone network. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that Liversidge fails to show or disclose at least the above limitation required by claim 59.

Liversidge discloses in paragraph [0187] that the VTE server sends a PlayInvitation message through the data packet network to the conference bridge instructing the conference bridge to play an Invitation message. The conference bridge uses text-to-speech conversion to play an announcement to the team member using VTE client (C). Therefore VTE client (C) receives an invitation audio signal from the conference bridge. Liversidge fails to disclose that any of the VTE clients (A) or (B) are involved in transmitting the audio signal to the VTE client (C), or that the VTE client (C) receives a invitation audio signal directly from VTE clients (A) or (B) (the conference endpoints). Therefore, Liversidge fails to disclose the step of receiving an audio signal representative of a conference code from at least one conference end point, as required by claim 59.

Thus, Liversidge fails to show or disclose at least one limitation required by claim 59. Therefore, claim 59 is patentable over Liversidge. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 60-65

Claim 60 requires, in part, that a conference endpoint receive over the telephone line interface from a remote conference endpoint a data conference invitation including information representative of a data conference code, wherein the data conference code when presented to a conference server by the endpoint authorizes the endpoint to join the data conference, and is configured to transmit a data conference join request including the data conference code to the conference server over the computer network in response to the received conference invitation. Note that the above limitation focuses on receiving an invitation to join a data conference form a remote endpoint and in response transmitting a

data join request to the conference server. Both the received invitation and the transmitted data join request include the conference code.

Reviewing the portions of Liversidge referenced by the Instant Office Action, in support of the rejection of claim 60, it is evident that the only communication between the VTE client (A) and the VTE client (C) is the communication labeled IPSet-up (FIG. 36a, 1498). Paragraph [0188] of Liversidge states "VTE client (A) uses the IP address provided in step 1480 to perform IP setup and content negotiation with VTE client (C) at step 1498." Liversidge is completely silent regarding VTE client (C) receiving an "invitation" from VTE client (A), as required by claim 60. That is, the IP setup and content negotiation is not an invitation to join a data conference. This is evident from the fact that message 1498 of IP setup and content negotiation is sent <u>after</u> the VTE client (C) has been successfully invited to the data conference[1]. It is needless for the VTE client (A) to send an invitation to VTE client (C) to join the data conference, when VTE client (C) has already joined the data conference in the preceding step 1472. Therefore, Liversidge fails to disclose or show at least the limitation required by claim 60 which states that the endpoint receives a conference invitation over the telephone line interface from a conference endpoint.

Even if it were assumed, *arguendo*, that the IP setup and content negotiation message 1498 is an invitation to join the data conference, Liversidge is still silent regarding the limitation required by claim 60 stating that the endpoint, in response to the invitation received from the remote endpoint, transmits a data join request to the conference server. As can be seen from FIG. 36a, after the VTE Client (C) receives the IP setup and content negotiation message from VTE client (A) in step 1498, VTE client (C) does not even communicate with the VTE server. Therefore Liversidge fails to show even a single transmission from the VTE client (C) to the server in response to the communication received from VTE client (A), leave alone showing that the transmission includes a data join request. Further, there is no necessity for the VTE client (C) to send

---

[1] Referring to FIG. 36a, paragraph [0188] of Liversidge clearly states that "The conference bridge then sends a message to the VTE server via the data packet network to inform the VTE server that the team member using VTE client (C) has accepted the invitation (step 1472)." Implying that the VTE client has accepted an invitation to join the multi-media conference at least by the end of step 1472 in FIG. 36a.

any join request to the VTE server when it is known that the VTE client (C) has already successfully joined the data conference in step 1472.

In light of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that Liversidge fails to teach at least one limitation of claim 60. Therefore, claim 60 is patentable over Liversidge. Claims 61 – 65 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 60, and are patentable over Liversidge for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection with respect to the above claims is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 54 over Liversidge in view of Sammon, below.

As discussed above, in relation to the § 102(e) rejections, independent claim 53 is patentable over Liversidge. Sammon has been cited merely to provide that it teaches the act of distributing one or more files comprising web pages. Sammon fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 53 or provide that which Liversidge lacks with respect to claim 53. Specifically, Sammon fails to teach or suggest the server transmitting a conference code to the requesting endpoint over the computer network, as required by claim 53. Therefore, Liversidge and Sammon considered separately or in combination, fail to teach all the limitation required by independent claim 53. Therefore, claim 53 is patentable over Liversidge and Sammon. Claim 54 depends directly from claim 53, and is patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the present claims are allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

January 11, 2008	**/Raymond Reese/**
Date	R. Scott Reese
	Reg. No. 47,891
	Attorney for Applicant

WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,
  RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, LLP
20333 State Highway 249
Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77070
832/446-2400
832/446-2424 (facsimile)